## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA ASHEVILLE DIVISION

## CRIMINAL NO. 1:04CR55

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	)	
	)	
	)	
VS.	)	ORDER
	)	
	)	
JAMES THOMAS McMURRY	)	
	)	

THIS MATTER is before the Court on the parties' plea agreement, filed June 25, 2004.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that defense counsel review the attached waiver with the Defendant, obtain the Defendant's signature witnessed by defense counsel or notarized, and file the waiver with the Clerk no later than 24 hours prior to the sentencing hearing scheduled for Thursday, June 16, 2005.

The Clerk of Court shall send a copy of this Order and attached waiver to the United States Attorney.

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA ASHEVILLE DIVISION

## CRIMINAL NO. 1:04CR55

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	)	
	)	
	)	
VS.	)	WAIVER
	)	
	)	
JAMES THOMAS McMURRY	)	
	)	

THIS MATTER is before the Court on the parties' plea agreement, filed June 25, 2004. By separate Order, defense counsel has been ordered to review this waiver with the Defendant, obtain the Defendant's signature thereon and witness same or have the waiver notarized, and file the waiver with the Clerk no later than 24 hours prior to the sentencing hearing scheduled for Thursday, June 16, 2005.

Prior to January 12, 2005, the Court was required under federal law to consider and follow the applicable Sentencing Guidelines in sentencing federal defendants and the Court could depart from those Guidelines only in specific circumstances. Since that time, the United States Supreme Court has determined in the case of *United States v. Booker*, 125 S. Ct. 738 (Jan. 12, 2005), that the Court is not bound by the Sentencing Guidelines but nevertheless must consult the Guidelines and take them into account when sentencing.

The Defendant has previously entered into a written plea agreement with the Government. At the time the Defendant entered into that plea agreement, the Court was required by law to sentence the Defendant in accordance with the Sentencing Guidelines. However, as a

result of the *Booker* decision, the Defendant may elect to be sentenced by the Court using its discretion and referring to the Guidelines as advisory. If appealed, the sentence would be reviewed by the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals for reasonableness. If the Defendant makes this election, the sentence the Court imposes will be in the Court's sound discretion and could be greater or less than the sentence that would have been imposed if the Sentencing Guidelines were mandatory. Either way, the Court will follow the procedural components of the Guidelines system, which means that the Probation Office has prepared a presentence report which contains Guidelines calculations and both the Defendant and the Government have been given an opportunity to object to any alleged deficiencies in that report. The Court will, however, resolve any disputes.

The Defendant and defense counsel are, therefore, required to inform the Court whether the Defendant wishes to be sentenced pursuant to the Sentencing Guidelines as mandatory or by this Court using the Guidelines as advisory.

Is it the request of the Defendant JAMES THOMAS McMURRY that your sentence be determined in accordance with the United States Sentencing Guidelines as mandatory and that the Court impose the sentence that would be required by the Sentencing Guidelines?

YES:	NO:
------	-----

If the Defendant has answered "Yes," he must then answer the following questions:

Do you	agree to the following:	:		
	(1) to have your senten	ce determined pursua	ant to the United States Sentencing	
	Guidelines;			
	YES:	-	NO:	
	(2) to waive the right to	o have the facts that c	determine the offense level under the	e
	Guidelines, including f	facts that support any	specific offense characteristics or	
	other enhancements or	adjustments, alleged	l in an indictment and found by a jur	У
	beyond a reasonable do	oubt;		
	YES:	<u>-</u>	NO:	
	(3) to have the facts that	at determine the offer	nse level found by the Court at	
	sentencing by a prepon	derance of the evider	nce which may be established by any	у
	reliable evidence, inclu	iding hearsay evidenc	ce;	
	YES:	-	NO:	
	(4) to waive constitution	onal challenges to the	e validity of the Sentencing Guidelin	ies
	and to the Sixth Amen	dment right to have th	he Guidelines considered in an	
	advisory capacity?			
	YES:	-	NO:	
THIS t	the	day of	, 2005.	

DEFENDANT			
COUNSEL FO	R DEFE	ENDANT	

**Signed: May 26, 2005** 

Lacy H. Thornburg United States District Judge